

OCT 23 2006

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL
October 23, 2006YOR920030455US1
Serial No. 10/720,564

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 7, 12 – 16, and 18 – 20 remain in the application and are finally rejected. Claim 17 is objected to and so, canceled and rewritten as new claim 28. Claims 8 – 11 and 21 – 27 are canceled herein as being drawn to a non-elected invention. The final rejection is respectfully traversed.

The final Office action indicates that claim 17 encompasses patentable subject matter, but depends from a rejected base claim and so, is objected to. Accordingly, by this proposed amendment, claim 17 is canceled and rewritten as new claim 28. Further, claims 18 and 19, which depended from claim 17 are amended to depend from new claim 28. No new matter is added. Therefore, having rewritten claim 17 in independent form as directed by the final Office action, claim 28 is allowable. Also, claims 18 and 19, which depend from claim 28, are allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 17 (now 28), of the rejection of claims 18 and 19, and allowance of claims 28, 18 and 19 is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended for grammar. No new matter is added.

Claims 1 – 7, 12 – 16 and 18 – 20 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over published U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0057286 to Shephard et al. The final rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 recite that “power grid lines [are] discontinuous in the vicinity of each said at least one inductor, whereby power grid line loops are open in the vicinity of each said at least one inductor.” It is clear from Figure 4, from the written description of Figure 4, and from claims 1 and 12, that “discontinuous” refers to lacking electrical

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL
October 23, 2006

YOR92003045SUS1
Serial No. 10/720,564

continuity, i.e., discontinuous electrically. See, e.g., page 13, line 20 – page 14, line 10. Specifically, “the wire gaps prevent current-loops that could otherwise occur in a typical continuous power grid.” Page 10, lines 4 – 5. Therefore, since the “the grid 400 represents the power,” the power distribution loops are interrupted and terminate in the vicinity of the inductor, i.e., “the power grid discontinuities form a fingered gap 404 pattern in both vertical and horizontal power grid lines in the immediate vicinity of the spiral inductor 402 to minimize local power grid wire loops without interrupting local power distribution.” *Id.*

Dropping vias in this region to connect power grid wires with underlying grid wires as taught by Shephard et al., defeats this discontinuity and, instead guarantees power grid wire loops, e.g., with vias at one end. Thus, while making small cuts in the power grid, as far as it goes, might correspond to a power grid with physically discontinuous grid lines; because dropping the vias maintains electrical continuity, “power grid line loops are [not] open in the vicinity of each ... inductor.” Therefore, Shephard et al. fails to teach or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 1 and 12.

Similarly, with regard to claims 6 and 16, while the Shephard et al. power grid might be structured to have a fingered gap at inductors, because the Shephard et al. vias connect power grid lines with lower grid lines, the power lines are not terminated “on endpoints of a fingered gap pattern in the immediate vicinity of said at least one inductor.”

Furthermore, since dependent claims include all of the differences with the references as the claims from which they depend, Shephard et al. does not teach the present invention as recited in claims 2 – 5, 7, 13 – 15 and 20, which depend from claims 1, 6, and 12, respectively. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection of

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL
October 23, 2006

YOR920030455US1
Serial No. 10/720,564

claims 1 – 7, 12 – 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Shephard et al. is respectfully requested.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance, both for the amendment to the claims and for the reasons set forth above, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendment, reconsider and withdraw the objection to claim 28 (17), reconsider and withdraw the final rejection of claims 1 – 7, 12 – 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and allow the application to issue.


Should the Examiner believe anything further may be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes.

Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0510 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully Submitted,

October 23, 2006
(Date)

Customer No. 33233
Law Office of Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
11703 Bowman Green Dr, Suite 100
Reston, VA 20190
Telephone: (703) 481-0532
Facsimile: (703) 659-1485


Charles W. Peterson, Jr.
Registration No. 34,406